

REMARKS:

Claims 1-3 and 5-18 are pending in the application. By this amendment, claims 1-3, 5, 6, 10, and 11 are amended, and claims 7, 8, and 16 are canceled. Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

All pending claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for using the terms “intended radial direction,” “intended axial direction,” and/or “intended circumferential direction,” it not being clear what was intended by “intended.” Applicant has amended the claims to refer to directions that correspond to the eventual radial, axial, and/or circumferential direction of the finished stator or rotor component. Applicant submits that such revised language would be properly understood by one having skill in the art and therefore requests that the rejection be withdrawn to the extent it applies to non-canceled claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 13, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Havard et al., U.S. 5,483,034.¹ Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

In particular, the claims are amended to describe more precisely the subject matter described in the specification portion of the application. In this regard, the first wall member is now identified as being curved and extending in what will be the circumferential direction of the ultimate stator or rotor component (as well extending in the axial direction). Additionally, the claims now recite that the stator or rotor component is generally ring-shaped and that the curved first wall parts define an axially extending, substantially annular flow-guiding surface that

¹ Havard is the only art basis for rejecting the various claims, and these are the only claims identified as being rejected over Havard. At the end, the Office Action indicates that claims 11-15 would be allowed if the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is overcome, but claim 13 of that group is identified as rejected based on Havard. Conversely, claim 16 is not rejected over Havard, nor is it identified as being allowable but for the § 112 issues. Accordingly, it is not completely clear as to which claims the Examiner deems unpatentable over Havard and which claims he deems allowable over Havard but for the § 112 issues. Regardless, Applicant submits that the present amendments place all remaining claims in condition for allowance, so that ambiguity should be moot.

delimits a gas duct in the eventual radial direction of the stator or rotor component. (As such, the first wall parts are exposed to gas flowing through the stator or rotor component.)

In Havard, in contrast, the members (2) which the Examiner construes as the claim-recited first wall parts are apparently flat, not curved, and they are fitted inside of hollow stator or rotor vanes. As such, they can not define flow-guiding surfaces that delimit gas ducts. Moreover, given the likely assembly orientation of the Havard vanes – Havard does not actually disclose any specific orientation of the vanes – the members (2) would extend radially relative to the ultimate engine into which they would be assembled, not circumferentially. Accordingly, Havard does not anticipate the various claims remaining pending, and Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 11-15 are indicated to be directed to allowable subject matter if the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is overcome. In view of the foregoing, however, Applicant submits that all remaining claims are in condition for allowance, and timely Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

The undersigned representative requests any extension of time that may be deemed necessary to further the prosecution of this application.

The undersigned representative authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 14-1437, referencing Attorney Docket No.: 7589.049.NPUS01.

In order to facilitate the resolution of any issues or questions presented by this paper, the Examiner may directly contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion.

Novak, Druce & Quigg, LLP
1000 Louisiana, Suite 5300
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 571-3400
(713) 456-2836 (fax)
tracy.druce@novakdruce.com

Respectfully submitted,



Tracy W. Druce, Esq.
Reg. No. 35,493